Interview Summary G9/010,490		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner Paul D Kim 3729	Interview Summary	09/010,490	HATA ET AL.
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): 1) Paul D Kim. (3) Takashi Ishihara. 2) Joseph Gorski. (4) Kenji Tamata. Date of Interview: 21 October 2003. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) Deplicant 2) Deplicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Pyes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Demonstration by VTR Claim(s) discussed: 8,18 and 24. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW Summary ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See		Examiner	Art Unit
(3) Takashi Ishihara. (2) Joseph Gorski. (4) Kenji Tamata. Date of Interview: 21 October 2003. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Demonstration by VTR Claim(s) discussed: 8.18 and 24. dentification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was eached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) HE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SumMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SumMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SumMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See		Paul D Kim	3729
Date of Interview: 21 October 2003. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes If Yes, brief description: Demonstration by VTR. Claim(s) discussed: 8.18 and 24. dentification of prior art discussed: ☐ Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) HE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS iNVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW Summary ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative	e, PTO personnel):	
Date of Interview: 21 October 2003. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes If Yes, brief description: Demonstration by VTR. Claim(s) discussed: 8.18 and 24. Identification of prior art discussed: ☐ Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) HE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS iNVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	1) <u>Paul D Kim</u> .	(3) <u>Takashi Ishihara</u>	
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes If Yes, brief description: Demonstration by VTR Claim(s) discussed: 8.18 and 24. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al.Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	2) <u>Joseph Gorski</u> .	(4) <u>Kenji Tamata</u> .	
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) □ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes If Yes, brief description: Demonstration by VTR. Claim(s) discussed: 8.18 and 24. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) □ was not reached. h) □ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW See	Date of Interview: 21 October 2003.		*
If Yes, brief description: Demonstration by VTR . Claim(s) discussed: 8,18 and 24 . Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <a (a="" (see="" 18="" 24="" 713.04).="" 8,="" a="" action="" agreed="" al.="" allowable="" allowable,="" already="" also,="" amend="" amendments="" and="" appear="" applicant="" applicants="" applicants'="" are="" arguments="" attached.="" attached.)="" available,="" be="" been="" claims="" consideration.="" copy="" date="" date,="" description,="" et="" examiner="" file="" filed,="" first="" for="" form,="" formal="" formally="" from="" fuller="" has="" head="" href="Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation" if="" in="" include="" interview="" interview.="" is="" kamijima="" last="" later,="" limitations="" mailing="" month="" mounting="" mpep="" must="" necessary,="" no="" nterview.="" of="" office="" one="" or="" overcoming="" persuasive="" prior="" rejections="" render="" reply="" response="" rotatable".="" section="" see<="" siven="" statement="" substance="" summary="" td="" that="" the="" thereof="" this="" to="" where="" which="" wichever="" would="" written=""><td></td><td></td><td>entative]</td>			entative]
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	Claim(s) discussed: 8,18 and 24.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable". The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See</u>	Identification of prior art discussed:		
reached, or any other comments: <u>Discussed the proposed amendment including the limitation "the first head mounting section is rotatable"</u> . The limitations of amend claims 8, 18 and 24 appear that the applicants' arguments are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of Kamijima et al. Applicants are to file a response formally for consideration. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reac	hed. g)□ was not reached.	h)
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	reached, or any other comments: <u>Discussed the promounting section is rotatable</u> ". The limitations of am are persuasive in overcoming the prior rejections of	oposed amendment including t nend claims 8, 18 and 24 appe	he limitation "the first head ar that the applicants' arguments
NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See	(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, whe	ere no copy of the amendments	iner agreed would render the claims s that would render the claims
	allowable is available, a summary thereof must be a	attached.)	
	allowable is available, a summary thereof must be a THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OF NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a repl SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DAT FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEM	FFICE ACTION MUST INCLUD by to the last Office action has a TE, OR THE MAILING DATE O MENT OF THE SUBSTANCE O	already been filed, APPLICANT IS OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY OF THE INTERVIEW. See
	allowable is available, a summary thereof must be a THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OF NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a repl SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DAT FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEM	FFICE ACTION MUST INCLUD by to the last Office action has a TE, OR THE MAILING DATE O MENT OF THE SUBSTANCE O	already been filed, APPLICANT IS OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY OF THE INTERVIEW. See

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required